

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/690,634	FRAISSE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alexander Jamal	2643	

All Participants:

(1) Alexander Jamal.

(2) James Morris (34681).

Status of Application: non-final rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 30 November 2004

Time: 11am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4,7,8,21

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Contacted applicant's attorney to fix a USC 112 second paragraph issue in claim 4, and also to ask applicant to move limitations of claim 7 into the dependant claims in order to more clearly define the invention (a clock regeneration circuit used as part of an isolation barrier interface). Mr. Morris returned the phone call on 12-1-2004, and agreed to examine claim 4 to clarify the indefinite issue, he also stated that he would contact the applicants to discuss the possibility of moving limitation from claim 7 into the independent claims. Mr. Morris was contacted by the examiner on 12-7-2004 and received a correction to claim 4 (see examiner's amendment) and also informed the examiner that the applicant had decided not to amend the claim 7 limitations into any independent claims.